CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes

Progress the jurisdiction has made in carrying out its strategic plan and its action plan. 91.520(a)

This could be an overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that were proposed and executed throughout the program year.

Communities develop their own programs and funding priorities based on local needs using HUD's established guidelines to define projects/activities that may be undertaken to ensure each project/activity meets one of the national objectives of the CDBG Program. Housing rehabilitation continues to be a focus for using CDBG grant money to meet the City's housing goal of decent housing and objective of benefiting low and moderate income persons by improving the quality of owner housing which will increase the availability of permanent housing in standard condition at an affordable cost and retain attainable housing stock. The City undertook five housing rehabilitation projects in 2014. Three homeowners were extremely low income, one was very low and one was low-mod. Two of the homes were married couples with children, two were married couples, and one was a single female. Three homes were elderly. Work completed on these homes included repairing water leaks and replacing new water lines, repairing collapsed sewer line, replacing windows with new energy star windows, roofs, rotten siding, exterior doors and providing new HVAC to include duct work. Proper venting, floor work, and replacing bathtub with shower was also done. Smoke alarms were also provided. One house underwent mold testing and eradication.

The City also provided funding for four public service projects meeting the City's goal of suitable living environments and objectives of benefiting low and moderate income persons by improving and increasing access to services. The City's transportation assistance public service project improved the mobility of our elderly and disabled income eligible citizens. The City provided transpotation assistance for 100 individuals during Program Year 2014. The Utility Assistance Program assisted with utility payments for extremely low to low-income residents of Rogers. Priority was given to the elderly and homes where children resided. A total of 123 people were assisted with utility assistance in 2014. Of that total, only 19 were low income and two were low-mod. The rest were extremely low. Six of the individuals were disabled. Our third public service project was a grant to Sunshine School & Development to provide scholarships to children with developmental delays and/or disabilities from low-income families in Rogers. Twenty people were impacted by this 2014 Grant--13 were extremely low and 7 were low. The fourth public service project was a grant to the Community Clinic which provided funds to purchase consumable supplies and medications necessary to treat 5,779 children seen at the Rogers clinic. Sixty percent were extremely low income, 25% very low, 10% low and 5% moderate. Forty four percent were Caucasian, 53% Hispanic, 1% African-American, 1% Pacific Islander, and 1% Asian.

The City had one facility project for 2014 and that was a continuing project which provided funding for sidewalks in the census tracts of Rogers

designated as low income. Design of this project started in 2013 with construction starting in 2014.

Comparison of the proposed versus actual outcomes for each outcome measure submitted with the consolidated plan and explain, if applicable, why progress was not made toward meeting goals and objectives. 91.520(g)

Categories, priority levels, funding sources and amounts, outcomes/objectives, goal outcome indicators, units of measure, targets, actual outcomes/outputs, and percentage completed for each of the grantee's program year goals.

Goal	Category	Source / Amount	Indicator	Unit of Measure	Expected - Strategic Plan	Actual – Strategic Plan	Percent Complete	Expected - Program Year	Actual – Program Year	Percent Complete
Administration	Administration	CDBG:	Other	Other	5000	0	0.00%	5000	0	0.00%
Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG:	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	30	5	16.67%	6	5	83.33%
Public Service - One Child, One Advocate	Neglected and Abused Children	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	125	5779	4,623.20%	3000	5779	192.63%
Public Service - One Child, One Advocate	Neglected and Abused Children	CDBG:	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	0	0		0	0	

Public Service - Sunshine School	Childhood Education for Disabled Children	CDBG:	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	75	20	26.67%	15	20	133.33%
Public Service - Transportation Assistance	Transportation Assistance	CDBG:	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	350	0	0.00%	80	0	0.00%
Public Service - Utility Assistance	Utility Assistance	CDBG:	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	270	128	47.41%	50	128	256.00%
Public Service - Boys and Girls Club (Rogers Unit)	Child Care	CDBG:	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	1560	0	0.00%			

Sidewalks, Streets, Drainage	Street Improvements	CDBG:	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	5000	0	0.00%	920	0	0.00%	
------------------------------------	------------------------	-------	---	---------------------	------	---	-------	-----	---	-------	--

Table 1 - Accomplishments - Program Year & Strategic Plan to Date

Assess how the jurisdiction's use of funds, particularly CDBG, addresses the priorities and specific objectives identified in the plan, giving special attention to the highest priority activities identified.

Housing and emergency repairs comprised 31% of the funds spent in 2014. The City undertook five homes for rehabilitation or emergency repair. A total of 13 individuals were helped by this program. The City earmrked 100% of their 2013 housing dollars on this objective. Additional application were received in late 2014, but we were unable to get them bid and ready for construction before 2015. Public Service projects used 12% of the funds spent in 2014. The City provided free rides for 100 elderly and disabled citizens who met the HUD income guidelines. Utility assistance provided help with electric, gas, and water bills for 123 extremely low to lod-mod residents of Rogers. Sunshine School & Development provided scholarships for developmentally mental and physical disabled children touching the lives of 30 individuals. Community Clinic provided funds to purchase consumable supplies and medications to treat 5,779 children at the Rogers clinic. The City only had one public facility6 objective for 2014. The objective was to set up to provide sidewalks in the City's low income census tracts. The City spent 36% of their 2014 funding on this objective. Administration accounted for 6% of the funds spent. Fifteen percent of the 2014 funds were carried over for 2015 spending.

CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted

Describe the families assisted (including the racial and ethnic status of families assisted). 91.520(a)

	CDBG
White	5,696
Black or African American	58
Asian	57
American Indian or American Native	0
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	107
Total	5,918
Hispanic	3,088
Not Hispanic	2,830

Table 2 – Table of assistance to racial and ethnic populations by source of funds

Narrative

The CDBG number above includes total number in each household.

CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a)

Identify the resources made available

Source of Funds	Source	Resources Made Available	Amount Expended During Program Year
CDBG		1,737,265	62,835

Table 3 - Resources Made Available

Narrative

The figures above do not match everything in IDIS. The expected amount available matches what we have in the Con Plan for the five years, however, actual amount expended in Program Yer 2014 does not match what is in IDIS. IDIS shows \$205,213.39 was spent. Those funds were spent on housing rehabilitation and emergency repairs, public service projects, a public facility project, and administration.

Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Allocation	Actual Percentage of Allocation	Narrative Description
Low Income			Meet all criteria for CDBG funding
Individuals or Families	100	100	regardless of where they live

Table 4 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Narrative

All those who received funds in 2014 were in income ranges from extremely low, or low to low-mod. The sidewalk project is based on building in the census tract/block groups designated low income through the United States Census Bureau. The City spent 36% of their 2014 funding on the sidewalk project.

Leveraging

Explain how federal funds leveraged additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements were satisfied, as well as how any publicly owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that were used to address the needs identified in the plan.

The City does not receive any other monies for their programs other than CDBG funds. By partnering with non-profits, the City is able to leverage some of its funding to meet more needs, particularly in the public service category. These partnerships also enable the City to receive more applications especially when it comes to housing rehabilitation and emergency repairs. None of the City's funds expended in 2014 were used for matching grants by other agencies. The City is appreciative of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's funding that provides the City the resources to carry out their housing, public service, and public facility programs. The City contributes to the CDBG Program by providing the CDBG Administrator office space, utilities, janitorial services, phone and other items necessary to carry out the CDBG Program.

CR-20 - Affordable Housing 91.520(b)

Evaluation of the jurisdiction's progress in providing affordable housing, including the number and types of families served, the number of extremely low-income, low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income persons served.

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of Homeless households to be		
provided affordable housing units	0	0
Number of Non-Homeless households to be		
provided affordable housing units	0	0
Number of Special-Needs households to be		
provided affordable housing units	0	0
Total	0	0

Table 5- Number of Households

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of households supported through		
Rental Assistance	0	0
Number of households supported through		
The Production of New Units	0	0
Number of households supported through		
Rehab of Existing Units	6	5
Number of households supported through		
Acquisition of Existing Units	0	0
Total	6	5

Table 6 - Number of Households Supported

Discuss the difference between goals and outcomes and problems encountered in meeting these goals.

The City's outcomes were lower this year. Although we received seven applications were housing rehabilitation in 2014, we could only get five advertised and bids opened prior to year end. We continue to market the CDBG Housing Program to make sure the citizens of Rogers are aware of the grant money available for low-income residents.

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.

We are hopeful that our numbers at the end of our fifth year Action Plan will meet all our goals and outcomes as determined in our Consolidated Plan. The City will continue to make housing goals a priority by doing as many housing rehabilitation projects we can each year, working with non-profits and

developers to bring new affordable housing to Rogers. We will continue to educate the community about availability of funds.

Include the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons served by each activity where information on income by family size is required to determine the eligibility of the activity.

Number of Persons Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual
Extremely Low-income	6	0
Low-income	5	0
Moderate-income	2	0
Total	13	0

Table 7 – Number of Persons Served

Narrative Information

Note: When I downloaded this section, the HOME actual numbers were also included in the download. The City of Rogers does not get HOME funds. Don't know where those figures came from. I checked the 2013-2017 Con Plan and 2013 Action Plans and those numbers are not in any of those plans. Since the City does not have HOME fund, there would be no input into IDIS on HOME funds.

CR-25 - Homeless and Other Special Needs 91.220(d, e); 91.320(d, e); 91.520(c) Evaluate the jurisdiction's progress in meeting its specific objectives for reducing and ending

homelessness through:

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

The City of Rogers continues their commitment to decent and affordable housing to address the homelessness situation and those at risk of becoming homeless. The City partnered with the University of Arkansas for a point in time count in January 2013. The CDBG Administrator was a part of the 2013 point in time count team, and also the 2015 point in time count team. The City is also a member of Northwest Arkansas Continuum Care, a coalition of Northwest Arkansas cities and agencies who have teamed together to set a goal of targeting the homeless and assist individuals with accessing mainstream mental health and chemical dependence services. Part of the outreach is education of both the service providers and the communities to assist in eradicating homelessness. You can either choose to engage the community or you can ignore the problem. The City of Rogers chooses to engage the community.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

There are several organizations that exist in Northwest Arkansas that serve families or persons who are homeless or at a risk of becomning homeless. No funding was requested by those agencies in 2014. Although no actions were taken in 2014 to meet these transition needs, the Homeless Needs Assessment and Point in Time Count for the City has been a tool to enable the City to be better prepared to assist the homeless to make the transition to permanent housing and independent living. We have met with organizations interested in bringing transitional living facilities to Rogers, however, that organization has not moved forward with the project. The City receives no ESG funds.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again

The City of Rogers continues its ongoing efforts to increase the number of affordable housing units in Rogers and to help rehabilitate homes that would otherwise be destined for condemnation. We feel it is imperative to keep our housing stock in good shape and prevent anyone from being homeless due to the condition of their home. We don't have a large problem with youth living in existing foster care and residential facilities being discharged with no housing in place; however, we need to make sure that

adults being discharged from jails and other systems of care are not homeless upon release. This will require a good coordination from all agencies involved with homelessness.

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: likely to become homeless after being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); and, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs

The City is not an agency who can take this on. All we can do is be involved and provide support in areas that we are able to lend our CDBG funding to assist in making the transition to permanent housing and indpendent living and prevent these individuals and families from becoming homeless again.

CR-30 - Public Housing 91.220(h); 91.320(j)

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing

The City of Rogers does not have a Public Housing Office. All Section 8 vouchers are handled out of the Siloam Springs Housing Authority. The City does have 306 units of low income housing available with 56 of those units for elderly only. Another 72 senior units are scheduled for future construction when Federal funding is available. Another 60 unit complex for elderly recently opened. Some of those units will be designated as low income, but we have been unable to get anyone to let us know how many were designated low income. All of these units are energy star rated. The City continues to work in any endeavor it can to assure there is affordable housing. The CDBG Administrator stays in contact with the Siloam Springs Housing Authority and refers any residents who contact us to the Siloam Springs office for assistance.

Actions taken to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership

The CDBG Administrator attends and stays involved in any meetings and workshops to encourage involvement in management and participation in homeownership. Siloam Springs Housing Authority contacted the City about providing a place for a town hall meeting involving residents in Rogers who live in low-income housing and we have agreed to host that meeting. To date, we have not been contacted about when this meeting will take place.

Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs

Siloam Springs PHA is not designated as troubled.

CR-35 - Other Actions 91.220(j)-(k); 91.320(i)-(j)

Actions taken to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment. 91.220 (j); 91.320 (i)

Rogers, like the rest of the country, is seeing a drop in home prices that could put more homes within reach for the low to moderate-income families and individuals; however, with the nationwide loadn situation as it is today, getting qualified is a huge barrier to the prospective low-income home. The job situation can also be a barrier to affordable housing making it harder for low-income to save for a down payment. The City of Rogers has encouraged development of housing for low-income by being flexible as possible with the developer to ensure if low-income housing is built, the contractor will be profitable. Rogers has zoning ordinances allowing homes to be built on smaller parcels of land and we are seeing some developers build homes in the \$110,000 to \$120,000 price range.

Actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

The major obstacle to meeting all of the identified needs is the lack of funding resources. Applicant request amounts are generally much higher than the entitlement amount especially when it comes to the public service 15% cap. When feasible, the City partners with other non-profits to leverage the City's funding allocation.

Actions taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

Since the City uses a portion of their CDBG allocation for housing rehabilitation, we do come in contact with lead-based paint hazards. The City only did one house that was built before 1978, but no lead based paint testing was required because we did not disturb any paint in the house. When lead-based paint testing is needed, the City hires a certified lead-based paint testing company. Any remediations are done by a contractor who has attended an approved Lead Safe Work Practices training and has received a certificate for this training. Once the work is completed, the initial testing company comes back and re-tests the house to make sure everything has been done in accordance with Federal and State regulations. The homeowners are given a copy of both the initial and final test results.

Actions taken to reduce the number of poverty-level families. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

The City continued with their existing programs that promote a stable living environment and helps to reduce dependency. The City did five housing rehabilitation and home repairs to help the low-to-moderate-income remain in their homes. Our housing program promotes a stable living environment and reduces dependency and also prevents homelessness, financial hardships and possibly institutionalization. We will continue to work to maximize program dollars and opportunities in neighborhoods with the greatest number of low-to-moderate-income residents. The partnership the

City has with its non-profit agencies helps to provide services that could go a long way in providing that family with more income for the necessities of life and help keep that family out of the severe poverty level. Transportation assistance impacts our low income elderly and disabled citizens in that it allows them to use the money they need for transportation on other needs in their lives.

Actions taken to develop institutional structure. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

The Mayor, Director of Planning and Transportation, Chief Financial Officer, and CDBG Administrator provide fiscal and regulatory oversight of all CDBG funding sources and Federal grants. All reports in 2014 were submitted timely. Funds were drawn down in a timely manner and the City met their drawdown percentages prior to the November 1, 2014 deadline. The City's Action Plan for 2014 was also submitted on time.

Actions taken to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

The City of Rogers sought partnerships to leverage 2014 funding. If the cap on public services could be lifted, we would have been able to see more partnerships. The CDBG Administrator is a member of the Northwest Arkansas Continuum of Care organization. The membership of this organization consists of the majority of the housing and social service agencies in Northwest Arkansas.

Identify actions taken to overcome the effects of any impediments identified in the jurisdictions analysis of impediments to fair housing choice. 91.520(a)

For many households, low or no income is a major factor preventing their exercise of housing choice. Minority populations in the City of Rogers are confro9nted with an even higher precentage of their populations living in poverty compared to Whites. Households experiencing a severe lack of income and those unemployed typically face limitations in fair housing choice. The City and local Chamber of Commerce are continuing to work on expanding job opportunities through the recruitment of corporations, the provision of incentives for local corporations seeking expansion opportunities, and other activities airmed at reducing unemployment and expanding the base of higher income plus provide jobs that support persons with high school education, GED's, community colleges, and technical schools. Recruiting such industries can assist in increasing the local tax base while srving to provide the necessary income for more persons to earn a living wage and improve their ability to qualify for home ownership. The City is also working to increase public awareness of fair housing rights and local fair housing legislation.

CR-40 - Monitoring 91.220 and 91.230

Describe the standards and procedures used to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and used to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements

CDBG Staff administered all activities in compliance with HUD regulations. All agencies receiving funding entered into an agreement with the City of Rogers and were monitored by the CDBG Administrator. All housing rehabilitation activities followed bidding requirements except those that were deemed emergency and required immediate help. An emergency is when a health and/or safety issue is at hand. Work was permitted and inspected prior to the start of the work, during the work, and at the end of the work before final payment was made. Any code violations found at initial inspection was added to the scope of work. The City's transportation assistance program was monitored to make sure all recipients of free rides met all the income requirements established by HUD for 2014. A file was set up for each activity and all documentation for that activity was made a part of the completed file used by HUD for their onsite monitoring. Three City employees, the Treasurer, the Director of Planning and Transportation, and the CDBG Administrator oversaw the handling of City's CDBG funds. This provided a good check and balance for these funds. The CDBG Office was also a part of the City's annual audit and all paperwork concerning the audit was filed in accordance with Federal guidelines. No files were archived that had not been inspected by the Arkansas HUD Office. The City made sure all grantees who performed services for the City complied with all applicable Federal regulations governing their administrative, financial, and program operations. The CAPER and IDIS continue to be used as effective monitoring resource documents. They serve as accurate measures of performance in terms of eligible beneficiaries served, program target areas, and dollars identified for the project.

Citizen Participation Plan 91.105(d); 91.115(d)

Describe the efforts to provide citizens with reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment on performance reports.

Two public hearings were held prior to the submittal of the 2014 Action Plan. The first public hearing was held in July prior to the planning process and the second was held in October upon completion of the plan. A display ad was published in the newspaper a week prior to each public hearing. The local newspaper also ran an article about CDBG funds and how those funds would be spent. The CDBG Administrator also contacted numerous non-profits and agencies that provide service to those in need who live in the City. The City gave our citizens a 30-day comment period prior to submitting the 2014 Action Plan to HUD. All public hearints were held in buildings that had access for persons with disabilities. The hearings were scheduled during the evening to provide working individuals and families a greater opportunity to attend. Because Rogers has a large Spanish speaking polulation, a billingual (English/Spanish) person was made available to non-English speaking persons. Copies of these plans were placed in four locations in Rogers as well as online making accessibility to the Plans easy for our

citizens. The CAPER was also placed at four locations as well as online and a 15-day comment period was also given prior to submitting this CAPER to HUD. The City also published the Finding of No Significant Impact on the Environment and Intent to Request Release of Funds. No amendment to the Plan was needed in 2014.

CR-45 - CDBG 91.520(c)

Specify the nature of, and reasons for, any changes in the jurisdiction's program objectives and indications of how the jurisdiction would change its programs as a result of its experiences.

Does this Jurisdiction have any open Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants?

[BEDI grantees] Describe accomplishments and program outcomes during the last year.

CR-60 - ESG 91.520(g) (ESG Recipients only)

ESG Supplement to the CAPER in e-snaps

For Paperwork Reduction Act

1. Recipient Information—All Recipients Complete

Basic Grant Information

Recipient Name ROGERS
Organizational DUNS Number 716010719
EIN/TIN Number 716010719
Indentify the Field Office LITTLE ROCK

Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance

ESG Contact Name

Prefix
First Name
Middle Name
Last Name
Suffix
Title

ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1
Street Address 2

City State

ZIP Code Phone Number Extension Fax Number

Email Address

ESG Secondary Contact

Prefix First Name Last Name Suffix Title

Phone Number Extension

Email Address

2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

Program Year Start Date 01/01/2014

3a. Subrecipient Form – Complete one form for each subrecipient

Subrecipient or Contractor Name
City
State
Zip Code
DUNS Number
Is subrecipient a vistim services provider
Subrecipient Organization Type
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount

CR-65 - Persons Assisted

4. Persons Served

4a. Complete for Homelessness Prevention Activities

Number of Persons in	Total
Households	
Adults	
Children	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
Total	

Table 8 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities

4b. Complete for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

Number of Persons in	Total
Households	
Adults	
Children	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
Total	

Table 9 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

4c. Complete for Shelter

Number of Persons in	Total
Households	
Adults	
Children	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
Total	

Table 10 – Shelter Information

4d. Street Outreach

Number of Persons in	Total
Households	
Adults	
Children	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
Total	

Table 11 – Household Information for Street Outreach

4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG

Number of Persons in	Total
Households	
Adults	
Children	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
Total	

Table 12 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG

5. Gender—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Male	
Female	
Transgender	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
Total	

Table 13 – Gender Information

6. Age—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Under 18	
18-24	
25 and over	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
Total	

Table 14 – Age Information

7. Special Populations Served—Complete for All Activities

Number of Persons in Households

Subpopulation	Total	Total Persons Served – Prevention	Total Persons Served – RRH	Total Persons Served in Emergency Shelters
Veterans				
Victims of Domestic Violence				
Elderly				
HIV/AIDS				
Chronically Homeless				
Persons with Disabili	ties:	•	•	
Severely Mentally III				
Chronic Substance Abuse				
Other Disability				
Total (unduplicated if possible)				

Table 15 – Special Population Served

CR-70 – ESG 91.520(g) - Assistance Provided and Outcomes

10. Shelter Utilization

Number of New Units – Rehabbed	
Number of New Units – Conversion	
Total Number of bed - nigths available	
Total Number of bed - nights provided	
Capacity Utilization	

Table 16 – Shelter Capacity

11. Project Outcomes Data measured under the performance standards developed in consultation with the CoC(s)

CR-75 – Expenditures

11. Expenditures

11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2012	2013	2014
Expenditures for Rental Assistance			
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance			
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services			
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program			
Subtotal Homelessness Prevention			

Table 17 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2012	2013	2014
Expenditures for Rental Assistance			
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance			
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services			
Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program			
Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing			

Table 18 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

	Dollar Amoun	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2012	2012 2013 2		
Essential Services				
Operations				
Renovation				
Major Rehab				
Conversion				
Subtotal				

Table 19 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

11d. Other Grant Expenditures

	Dollar Amou	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year			
	2012	2012 2013 2014			
Street Outreach					
HMIS					
Administration					

Table 20 - Other Grant Expenditures

11e. Total ESG Grant Funds

Total ESG Funds Expended	2012	2013	2014

Table 21 - Total ESG Funds Expended

11f. Match Source

	2012	2013	2014
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds			
Other Federal Funds			
State Government			
Local Government			
Private Funds			
Other			
Fees			
Program Income			
Total Match Amount			

Table 22 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

11g. Total

Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG	2012	2013	2014
Activities			

Table 23 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities